PHILIP MORRIS INCORPORATED

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

To: S. Hutcheson

Date: September 30, 1980

From: W. A. Farone

REC'D OCT 1 - 1980

Subject: PM 838/Improved Process for Dissimilatory Denitrification of Tobacco Material - Response to Office Action Allowing Claims 1-19 - Teng and Semp

I feel the removal of Claim 20 will not change the value of this case. Based on our discussions with T. Gillis, I also feel that subsequent improvements (e.g. fed batch) and other effects (e.g. reduction in CO) should be handled separately so as not to impede the issue of this patent. If the other cases we intend to file are judged not sufficiently different than our own prior art, we will, at least, have that judgment as a basis to preclude patentability for others. However, in my technical judgment, as discussed at the meeting, the other disclosures are sufficiently different and unique enough in their results to warrant separate applications. I believe this technical judgment is supported by the chronology of events involved in the inventions as well as involvement of different potential inventors.

The entire series of cases (past, present and future) in the controlled fermentation area is an excellent example of developing a strategy in an area of technology to bring technical effort to bear leading to inventive results. I foresee a string of potential inventions, much as we have done in laser perforation technology, leading to a good patent position for P.M. Your continued inputs on the differences and similarities between disclosures and further needed information are always welcome.

W. A. Farone

/hws

cc: R. B. Seligman
A. Palmer, Jr.
C. H. O'Donohue

2026507640

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/ztnj0000